	E3sdsecc Conference	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	
4	COMMISSION Application to Compel Compliance with Federal Agency Investigative	
5	Subpoenas,	
6	Applicant, New York, N.Y.	
7	v. 14 MC 00061 P1	
8	CHARLES RIEL III a/k/a "Chuck Riel" and REINVEST LLC,	
9	Respondents.	
10	x	
11 12	March 28, 2014 3:10 p.m.	
13	Before:	
14	HON. RONNIE ABRAMS,	
15	District Judge	
16	APPEARANCES	
17	UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION	
18	Attorneys for Applicant BY: CHRISTOPHER M. CASTANO PREETHI KRISHNAMURTHY	
19		
20	CHARLES RIEL III Respondent Pro Se	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	II	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

E3sdsecc Conference THE CLERK: In the matter of Securities and Exchange Commission versus Riel III, also known as Chuck Riel, et al., docket number 14 Miscellaneous 61. Counsel, please state your names for the record. MR. CASTANO: Christopher Castano for applicant Securities and Exchange Commission. Good afternoon, your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon. MS. KRISHNAMURTHY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Preethi Krishnamurthy for the applicant as well. THE COURT: Good afternoon. MR. REIL: Good afternoon. My name is Chuck Riel. THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Riel. Mr. Riel, I'm happy to hear you out on this, but reviewing your correspondence with the SEC, I see that you have raised a number of issues for not complying with the subpoena -- that you are concerned your responses won't be

complete, that you've taken down what you perceive is any misleading content on the website and that you don't fall within the securities laws -- but none of these reasons allows you to resist compliance.

I am happy to hear you out but --

MR. REIL: Well, obviously, your Honor, I am not -- I have no experience in the law.

THE COURT: OK. Just as background, you know, we are

Conference

here on an order to show cause. So on March 13th I signed an Order that required you to appear today and show cause why you shouldn't be ordered to produce documents and appear for testimony, as called for by the Commission's January 31, 2014 subpoena. Right? So that's why we're here today.

My March 13th Order also required respondent REinvest to appear today and show cause why it should not be ordered to produce documents as called for by the Commission's January 13th subpoena.

So you are here representing yourself, and are you representing REinvest as well?

MR. REIL: I am REinvest.

THE COURT: You are REinvest?

MR. REIL: Yes.

THE COURT: So as I said, I am happy to hear you out, but to obtain an order enforcing an administrative subpoena, the Commission only needs to show a few things. I will tell you what they are — that the investigation will be conducted pursuant to a legitimate purpose, that the inquiry may be relevant to that purpose, that the information sought that they're seeking is not already within their possession, within the Commissioner's possession, and that the administrative steps required have been followed. So that is the law.

I think that they have established each of those elements based on the submissions I have. But this is an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Conference

opportunity for you to show cause, to explain why you haven't complied with the subpoenas and whether or not you intend to comply with them going forward.

MR. REIL: OK.

THE COURT: Does that make sense?

MR. REIL: That makes sense, your Honor.

I put together some things here that I would like you to go through.

THE COURT: OK. It would have been nice -- you understand the order to show cause has dates by which you were to submit any documents? But I will listen to you now.

MR. REIL: Your Honor, I will look at them now. Like I said, your Honor, I have no legal experience.

Unfortunately, I am a small business owner. I do not have the money to get experienced counsel to address this issue.

THE COURT: As I said, I am happy to look at those documents today. Do you have a copy for the government lawyers?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  REIL: I have a copy for you and I have a copy here for myself.

THE COURT: OK. Well, are you asking that they not be permitted to look at what you have?

MR. REIL: No. No. No. What I've actually done is I've tried to make this as simple and literal as I could,

## Conference

and I simply went through the material that they have here and I simply indexed what they had there and my responses here.

I have to tell you, I have got some real concerns in that I've already expressed so many times that I don't understand -- I don't understand how this thing could even be possible based on what we have done, based on what the real situation is. There is no one anywhere that has ever filed a complaint about us. I have documented here, this was started as a side -- this is not our primary business. It was started as a side project by my dad. He passed away a couple of years ago and he asked that I keep that running for him for three years, which this year was that. And I explained all that in the letters to the Commission.

So as of this date, we've removed the website. We have nothing to do with those activities. Everything relating to it is actually defunct. This whole thing is a concern over five -- five -- private loan arrangements based on a basic, simple promissory note. There is no equity. There is no ownership attached to anything. We've never had anything to do with any kind of a financial security.

So I am just totally perplexed how this situation could even exist.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. REIL: And my concern is not only what I just stated but my concern is that it seems not only myself and

## Conference

REinvest being the same, but what about the five individuals that we have these private agreements with? It simply makes no sense.

My understanding of the Commission, as a regulatory commission, they're set up to ensure that specific kinds of compliance are kept and met within the securities industry. We have nothing to do with any of that. We never have.

And not to mention -- no, I should mention -- on the 14th of March, which I also have in here, I received a letter from a Mr. Vitulano's office. And in that letter -- it was overnighted to me -- it said that the Commission has concluded with their investigation and inquiry. There would be nothing more required from me. OK. Three hours later I get overnights from the Commission that says court papers were filed. And for three to four days later UPS has come back every single day with an order -- an order from UPS to get back that delivery.

Now, I'm concerned about that, first off. And I'm also concerned about the fact that every letter, every communication that I've ever received from the Commission, I have tried to very respectfully communicate. I didn't ignore anything. Unfortunately, I didn't do that clear enough where they had a good enough understanding where they trusted in what I said.

But the bottom line is I communicated to every single letter that I received from them. I've talked to a couple of

Conference

people from Mr. Vitulano's office. I'm not sure if I'm saying that name right but it's Steve. So I've tried to communicate to the point where I felt it made sense. But at this point it looks like my rights and the individual rights of the people involved — and there's five — no one is addressing that issue. I'm getting double-talk communication from the Commission. On one hand, it's been closed and there is nothing more required of me. On the other hand, papers have now been filed.

THE COURT: OK. I am happy to hear from the Commission. Just to be clear, though, this proceeding is not about the merits of whether or not you or REinvest did anything wrong. That's not what this is about. I have a very limited role here today. They served subpoenas for documents and for testimony and they want to enforce that, meaning they want to make sure that you comply with those subpoenas. That's all this proceeding is about. Right? I just want to make sure you understand that. OK?

MR. REIL: All right. I understand that.

I can't help but feel like I'm being treated like a criminal. I have never had any issues before --

THE COURT: I certainly don't mean to treat you like a criminal.

MR. REIL: I don't mean you. I just mean the whole way that this thing has come together. And when you really

Conference

look at what it's based on, it seems that it is all based on certain things that were put on a website that when it was brought to my attention it was removed. The site doesn't exist any longer. It was only in existence for about a three-year period. We're talking about a total amount of money that probably — this makes no sense to me.

THE COURT: OK. I understand your position.

MR. REIL: So I don't -- I don't understand how and why I could be demanded to comply with this kind of thing when it shows total disregard for the individuals involved and their own personal rights.

THE COURT: Well, as I said earlier, I read you what is the standard under the law for enforcing an administrative subpoena, which is what this is.

Based on the Declaration of Christopher Castano and the other supporting documents that I have here that you've seen, I do believe that the Commission has established each of the elements to justify this administrative subpoena. So the investigation, in my view, is being conducted for a legitimate purpose, to determine whether respondents violated the securities laws on their websites. The answer to that ultimately may be no, but it's a legitimate purpose. OK? So that's the first prong of this standard.

Information about the identity of the website's investors, its communications with them, and its use of their

## Conference

funds is relevant to that inquiry. Again, I am just going through this standard that I am required to look at under the law.

And, finally, the Commission has shown that it does not already have this information in its possession and that it served a subpoena in the fashion that it was required to, in accordance with the administrative steps required.

So that is the standard under the law of what they need to show. I think they've shown that in these documents. And so the subpoenas are requesting the various documents no later than April 11th, and requesting or directing you to appear for testimony on April 18th. That's what the subpoena is asking for.

If the documents that you have here today -- and I am happy to take a look at them, but if they are in your view responsive to the subpoena, that may be a manner by which you are responding to the subpoena. I don't know if they are or they aren't; I haven't looked at them. But maybe you are willing to comply with the subpoena.

I mean, are you willing to show up for testimony on that date and provide documents responsive to their request?

MR. REIL: I don't know specifically what you are speaking of, "documents."

THE COURT: OK. Can you get out a copy of the subpoena and read it into the record, please?

## Conference

1 What tab is it at?

MR. CASTANO: 5.

THE COURT: 5?

MR. CASTANO: For the Court, your Honor, the Commission is seeking all documents concerning any securities or investment opportunities offered by or through REinvest, including, without limitation --

THE COURT: Just slow down a little bit for the court reporter. Thank you.

MR. CASTANO: Including, without limitation, brochures, communications with prospective or actual investors or members, including past investors or members, correspondence, and offering memorandum.

- 2. A list of all investors who have invested funds in programs offered by REinvest, including the name, address, phone number, and investment amount for each investor, as well as the name of the program in which he or she invested. All documents concerning the full name, address and contact information of all of the clients who provided recent testimonials on the 150PercentReturn.com website.
- 3. All documents concerning bank statements for all accounts maintained by REinvest.
- 4. All documents concerning agreements signed by investors in any investment program offered by REinvest, including, but not limited to, investors' subscriptions to the

Conference

1 | 150PercentReturn Program.

THE COURT: There are six more items. Do you want an extra copy of this, Mr. Riel? Do you have a copy of this subpoena?

MR. REIL: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: OK. I just want to make sure. So the section, when you asked about what documents are they requesting, it is towards the bottom of page 2. It is B, right? And so it is 1 through 10. It is all of those items that they are requesting. It's Tab 5 and it's a document entitled "Subpoena Attachment."

MR. CASTANO: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CASTANO: Also, there is another subpoena. It's Tab 11. The subpoenas are essentially identical.

THE COURT: OK. So there is one to you and one to the company.

MR. CASTANO: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So those are the documents they are requesting. You can work with the Commission. If you are not sure about what they are looking for, if there is some confusion on your part, you can talk to them about that.

Again, the proceeding here today is just to enforce this. It is just to make sure you comply with it, that you show up for testimony and you give the documents that they're

Conference

asking for, to the extent you have them. And so what this

Order to Show Cause that I signed -- I know it is legal lingo
and feel free to ask any questions, as you have, but it is just
directing you and the company REinvest to produce these
documents that are responsive on that list that are within your
possession, control or custody by April 11th, and then appear
for testimony before the Commission -- and there is the address
of the Commission -- on April 18th.

And then it says what you are supposed to do if you don't have the documents in your possession, custody or control; that you submit a sworn statement to the Commission describing the efforts you made to locate the responsive documents and the results of those efforts. Maybe you will have some responsive documents and not others, and you can, you know, write a statement as to what you have or don't have. I am going to leave that to you.

And then the Order says that in the event that you or REinvest don't produce the documents or statements by those dates that I told you -- Right? -- April 11th and April 18th, then the Commission will have established a prima facie case of civil contempt against REinvest and against you.

I mean, that is the gist. So the gist is if you don't do this, if you don't produce the documents or if you don't show up when you are supposed to show up for testimony, that you can be found in civil contempt. I think we all want to

## Conference

avoid that. That is not the goal here. The goal here is just to give you the opportunity to make sure you understand what's being asked of you and to make sure that you understand that if you don't comply with the subpoena, that you could be in contempt of court. So that's --

MR. REIL: What does that actually mean, your Honor?

THE COURT: There would be an order of contempt

against you for failing to comply. There are various things

that can happen as a result of contempt.

I don't know what the Commission normally requests in a situation like this.

MS. KRISHNAMURTHY: I did this just a few weeks ago, your Honor.

THE COURT: Could you just speak into the mic, please.

MS. KRISHNAMURTHY: Sure.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. KRISHNAMURTHY: There are various kinds of remedies. We typically ask for a fine to be assessed, usually on a per day basis until the person has complied with the subpoena, and in some cases we've also asked for the Court to arrest the contemnor until he complies or at least until he shows up in court.

THE COURT: So all those things can happen if you don't comply, and that's why we are here.

MR. REIL: So, your Honor, I'm being treated just as

## Conference

if I'm convicted of a crime and I am a criminal.

THE COURT: You are not being treated as if you have been convicted of a crime.

MR. REIL: I most certainly am.

THE COURT: No, you are not. You are being told that you have to comply with the Order, and if you don't comply with the Order then various things can happen, including the possibility of being sent to jail for failing to comply with a Court Order.

But the Order is requesting -- and I am going to sign an Order requiring you to comply with the subpoena, because, as I said, I think the Commission has met the standard required. You have the opportunity to comply, to show up for testimony, to produce the documents.

If you don't have the documents in your possession or control, you can write a statement, as I noted a minute ago, explaining what efforts you have made to locate the responsive documents. So that's what you are being asked to do, and that's what you are required to do under the law.

And then it's going to be left to you as to whether or not you follow my Order to do that, to comply with the subpoena.

(Pause)

Does that make sense?

MR. REIL: Well, I suppose as much as it can, yes.

# Conference

THE COURT: OK. All right. So as I stated earlier -MR. REIL: I understand, your Honor. I don't mean to
cut you off. I understand what you just said to me.

But I still, I have -- I don't know, I must be a pretty ignorant person or something, because I have no, no concept of how the United States Commission -- the United States Securities and Exchange Commission would not only be concerned but would put the resources into something as ridiculous as this. We are talking about five private loans that have nothing to do with the securities at all.

And, again, I know you are going to look at me and you're going to say, Mr. Riel, that has nothing to do with the proceeding. But every single document that they've sent me, it says this is a nonpublic investigation, number one.

This is all over the Internet. I had family members call me two days after and say to me they were so upset and wanted know what this was about. I asked them what are talking about. And they said they were doing searches on Google, and it is up on Google, which is bad enough, but they click the active link and the documents go right into their PC.

Now, what's wrong with that? Every single document here from the Commission, from day one, says this is absolutely nonpublic and I have not been convicted of anything and they are not accusing me of anything. Is that how you treat people that you haven't accused of something?

# Conference

THE COURT: Well, let me ask the Commission. I mean, was it nonpublic until you sought to enforce the subpoena?

MR. CASTANO: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, basically, it wasn't public until you didn't comply with what they're asking for, until you didn't comply with the Court -- with the subpoena, excuse me, and then they had to come to court and say we need to get an order to enforce the subpoena. And that's why it became public, because you didn't comply with the subpoena. That's what the Commission is saying. So nothing had been public prior to the time that you didn't respond to the subpoena.

MR. REIL: How did it get on the Internet?

THE COURT: I don't know how it got on the Internet.

Everything in court is public. So we're in a public courtroom.

All the filings are part of the court record. Everything that happens in this courtroom, with very small exceptions, is public.

So at the point that you didn't respond to the subpoena they came to court, and at the point they came to court that Order that I signed became public. How it got on the Internet I don't know specifically, but that's why it's public.

MR. REIL: Fine. And, your Honor, how could I receive a document signed by Mr. Steven Vitulano telling me that the inquiry/investigation has been closed, concluded, and that

## Conference

they're no longer going to be asking me for any documents?

THE COURT: Do you want to answer that?

MR. CASTANO: Yes, your Honor.

On March 13, 2014, without the Division of Enforcement's knowledge, members of the New York office's Broker-Dealer Inspection Program, and I understand your Honor knows that there are distinctions between different divisions at the SEC. The Broker-Dealer Inspection Program sent Mr. Riel a letter, which isn't the most clear letter, admittedly, indicating that its voluntary inquiry had been concluded. Now, that's the Broker-Dealer Inspection Program, that's not the SEC's Division of Enforcement, which we are here for and which we issued subpoenas. So it is a different division.

THE COURT: So it is understandable that Mr. Riel would be confused.

MR. CASTANO: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Riel, it is understandable that you were confused about that, that you got these mixed messages from different divisions. It is totally understandable. But we still are where we are, which is that this division of the SEC has subpoenaed these documents and your testimony.

Nothing is happening today. You are not going to jail today. You are not being fined today. You are here to be given the opportunity to comply. To the extent that there is confusion about whether the investigation was still open or

## Conference

not, now I think the confusion has been cleared up. But, again, it is understandable why you would have been confused.

So now it is up to you. I am going to sign this Order.

Do you have a proposed order for me?

MR. CASTANO: Your Honor, we do. We would like to make one edit to it.

We made a mistake to it. So we would like to have an opportunity to go back, make a correction, and send it to your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead. That is fine.

So I'm going to sign the proposed order allowing them to enforce the subpoena, and then it is going to be up to you, Mr. Riel, if you are going to comply with it. I hope you do. I don't want to hold you in contempt. But that's what's going to happen next, right?

So there are these dates in the Order, the

April 11th date and the April 18th date, and it is going to be

up to you to decide whether to comply with the subpoena. And

as I said, there could be very serious consequences if you

don't.

You know, of course, you are permitted to hire counsel, if you would like to do so.

MR. REIL: I can't afford to hire counsel.

THE COURT: Well, maybe you can try and obtain pro

Conference

bono counsel. You know, there are lawyers who represent people pro bono, which means free of cost. You can call the Bar Association. You can look into those opportunities online, "probono.net." There are various organizations. I don't know if you will be able to find someone. There is no right to counsel in a civil case. But in any event, you can make those efforts if you would like to do that.

So I am going to sign this Order, and I expect you to comply because I really don't want to hold you in contempt.

Do you understand that?

MR. REIL: Yes, your Honor. I do.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. CASTANO: Your Honor, just one other thing. In the proposed order you signed, Mr. Riel is to appear before the Commission for his testimony on Friday, April 18th.

THE COURT: Is that Good Friday?

MR. CASTANO: That's Good Friday, your Honor.

When we send you the proposed order, we are going to propose Monday, April 21st, if that is convenient with your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Mr. Riel, would it make a difference to you if we changed these dates a little bit, the date to comply? Basically, you know, I had said here you have to show me why you can't comply on these dates. Because we didn't want to make testimony on the day of Good Friday, we are going to

Conference

move the date to Monday. But if you told me, for example, that there was a date that was more convenient for you, maybe you could work that out with the SEC lawyers.

MR. REIL: You do realize that I'm 300 miles from here?

THE COURT: I do.

MR. REIL: Do you realize it is a 10-hour drive here and back?

THE COURT: OK. Well, look, I encourage you to talk to the Commission's lawyers. Maybe there is a date that's more convenient for you. And if you can work it out with them, I think that that's best for everybody.

This was not -- the dates aren't chosen to inconvenience you. So I'm encouraging you to talk to them to make it more convenient.

So I am going to sign an order, unless you tell me there is a particular date that is more convenient — and we can talk about that now — I will sign an order that says you have to produce these documents by April 11th and appear for testimony on April 21st, which is a Monday and it is not Good Friday. That's why we are switching that date.

MR. REIL: Obviously, you know, a couple of months would be much better than a few days from now.

THE COURT: Do you have any flexibility on the dates?

MR. CASTANO: Your Honor, we have a little bit of

24

25

Conference flexibility, but we issued the subpoena to REinvest --1 2 THE COURT: Back in January. 3 MR. CASTANO: January and, again, to Mr. Riel back in January, if not January 31st. You know, we would prefer --4 5 well, there is certainly a little bit of flexibility and we are 6 certainly reasonable, you know, extending this out months is 7 something we don't --8 THE COURT: Why don't you just take a minute. See if 9 you can agree on some dates with Mr. Riel. 10 MR. CASTANO: Sure. Thank you, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And then I will sign off on those dates. 12 MR. REIL: You are aware -- I know you are aware 13 because I know you have put a lot of effort in your research --14 you should know where I'm living, you know how long I have 15 lived there. I am the third generation of our family. You are not dealing with someone who is going to get up and run and 16 17 leave their family. 18 MR. CASTANO: That's not what we are saying. 19 (The parties conferred) 20 THE COURT: If you can't agree on a date, I am just 21 going to set one. 22 (The parties conferred) 23

THE COURT: May 1st is a Thursday, if that is what you are asking. So is May 1st the date for testimony or for documents?

25

## Conference

MR. CASTANO: Your Honor, May 1st is the day we would 1 propose for Mr. Riel's testimony, and one week prior to 2 3 May 1st -- two weeks, OK. At least two weeks prior to Mr. Riel's testimony we would like document production. 4 5 THE COURT: OK. So the documents will be due 6 April 17th, which is a little bit later -- six days later than 7 what was in the Order, and then the testimony will be on May 1st. And those are the documents I'm going to sign off on. 8 9 So you will submit a proposed order to me. 10 Is there anything else we need to discuss? 11 MR. CASTANO: That's it, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: OK. 13 MR. CASTANO: Thank you. 14 THE COURT: So, Mr. Riel, you understand, again, the 15 possibility of what could happen if you don't comply with the 16 subpoena? 17 MR. REIL: Yes, your Honor. I quess I do. I suppose 18 what you are telling me is that whatever is in here just 19 doesn't matter; is that what you are telling me? 20 THE COURT: No. I'm happy to look at it --21 MR. REIL: But you've already signed off. You've 22 already given them the go ahead. 23 THE COURT: Well, I am still here. So if you want me 24 to look at the documents -- I don't know what they are -- pass

them up and I'll look at them. I mean, if they are relevant to

Conference

whether or not you are required to comply with the subpoena, I am going to consider them.

MR. REIL: Thank you.

(Handing to the Court)

MR. CASTANO: Your Honor, I just note for the record --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CASTANO: -- that the SEC has not received a copy.

THE COURT: OK.

Mr. Riel, do you want to lend your copy to the Commission for a minute so they can read it while I am reading it?

MR. REIL: Yes. I see no problem with that.

(Handing to Commission counsel)

(Pause)

I think we've already discussed a number of the issues that you raise here. I did just want to just inform you about the law in one area. And that's the point that you make about REinvest being a small privately-held business entity that has nothing to do with financial securities. I wanted to respond to that just by letting you know that under the law individuals or companies can't contest subpoenas on the ground that their conduct was legal or that the investment vehicles were not securities.

## Conference

I am going to just say the names of various cases that stand for that proposition, opinions that have held that.

Endicott Johnson Corporation v. Perkins, 317 U.S. 501, 509

(1943), which is the citation of the case. United States v.

Construction Products Research, Incorporated, 73 F.3d 464, 470

(2d Cir. 1996). That is the Court of Appeals here in this district. NLRB v. CCC Associates, Incorporated, 306 F.2d 534, 538 (2d Cir. 1962). And FTC v. Texaco, Incorporated, 555 F.2d 862, 879, and that's from the D.C. Circuit in 1997.

And a quote from that case which involved the FTC, which is a different entity, says that, "If the parties under investigation could contest substantive issues in an enforcement proceeding when the Agency lacks the information to establish its case, administrative investigations would be foreclosed or at least substantially delayed."

You know, the idea behind these cases is that if there ends up being a substantive case down the line, that those issues are appropriately discussed there and not at the time when you are attempting to enforce a subpoena. So whether or not there was any illegal conduct or whether the investment vehicles were or were not securities is appropriately brought if and when there is a substantive case and not at this early stage where the Commission is just trying to get information.

OK?

Can I make this part of the record in this case?

II E3sdsecc

25

	Conference
1	MR. REIL: Absolutely, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: OK. So I will put it on the docket.
3	If you could give Mr. Riel his copy back.
4	MR. REIL: Thank you.
5	THE COURT: And, again, I hope and expect you to
6	comply with the subpoena. You can, as I said, try and obtain a
7	lawyer. I understand that you may not have money to afford
8	one, but if you want to talk to a lawyer about, you know,
9	whether or not you should take the Fifth Amendment, you know,
10	during your testimony or otherwise, you should try and find an
11	attorney. And there are various ways, there are bar
12	Associations, there are other entities that try and get people
13	attorneys pro bono is what it's called which represents
14	them for free, but I am going to leave that to you. OK?
15	So the Commission will submit the subpoena on
16	Monday I'm sorry, the Order, excuse me, the Order with the
17	revised dates that we discussed.
18	MR. CASTANO: We could send it to you today by email
19	if that is
20	THE COURT: That is fine. It won't be entered into
21	the docket until Monday morning.
22	MR. CASTANO: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: OK. Anything else, Mr. Riel?
24	MR. REIL: No. I don't think so, your Honor.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We are adjourned.